

A SECOND LOOK AT THE AUSTRIAN SITUATION

HON. FRANK J. BRASCO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 1972

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, very recently a group of young American Jews were involved in an altercation at the Austrian Embassy in Washington. It seems there was some physical contact involving the Austrian Ambassador to the United States. In the process, a swastika flag was hung from the front of the embassy in question. A message was attached to the flag, asking Americans to refrain from visiting "Nazi Austria."

I certainly deplore the violation of the grounds of the Austrian Embassy. And I hold no brief for those who would lay hands upon any ambassador of a sovereign state with which the United States maintains correct relations. But this incident deserves a little more research, particularly into reasons for such an outburst by young people who are law-breakers in a very different sense of the word than is ordinarily understood by our general public.

Austria is the spiritual home of nazism. Hitler was a native of Linz, Austria. Adolph Eichmann was also a citizen of that country. Austria's very name in the old European lexicon was "Oesterreich," which really means an eastern extension of the "Reich."

The Nazi movement was exceptionally strong from the start in this nation. When "Anschluss" arrived with Germany, cheering mobs of Hitler's sympathizers lined her roads to welcome his armies first, and himself later.

Antisemitism has deep roots in the Austrian consciousness, even, as some might say, in the soul of this small nation. Large numbers of native Austrians not only fought for and served Hitler ardently unto death, but also were involved in many stupefying crimes of the Nazi regime.

Hundreds of thousands of Austrians had more than a nodding acquaintance with the eastern portions of Europe which fell swiftly under Nazi domination at the start of the Second World War. These were singled out, although thousands volunteered cheerily, to administer conquered territories, all of which contained large numbers of Jews.

Austria was a Nazi nation to its last corpse, participating in a thousand ways in what the Hitler regime planned and carried forth across the face of Europe. Many of those tried and executed or imprisoned as a result of the Nuremberg trials were Austrian nationals.

As Nazi hordes spilled over and took control of Eastern Europe, an administrative infrastructure was created everywhere across these conquered territories. Gauleiters, or area governors, were set up, with a complete power structure be-

neath them, charged with exploitation of lands and extermination of undesirables. They were in charge of enforcing laws, producing slave labor in massive quantities and running a variety of activities. Among these were extermination camps, where upward of 6 million innocent Jews were murdered methodically, and toward the close of the war, on an assembly-line basis. Many of the people who staffed scores of death camps were Austrians. Many of those who dealt with the daily administration of mass murder were Austrians.

Hundreds and hundreds of death trains weekly crisscrossed Europe. Many carried Jews to their doom. Others carried loot from across Europe to feed and clothe the Nazi Germany and Austria.

Tens of millions of non-Jewish Europeans were exploited and murdered by this administrative infrastructure, which cooperated fully on a daily basis with the German Army, Gestapo, and SS.

Einsatzgruppen roamed areas behind frontlines, their sole purpose to round up and exterminate Jews, gypsies, and other so-called "undesirables." Many assassins in their ranks were Austrians. In fact, some of the most unspeakable crimes committed on a daily basis in the Second World War upon noncombatants were committed by Austrians.

After the war, an international outcry sought and obtained trial of the worst of these war criminals. Many trials were held across Europe for years, as these men and women were sought out, secured, brought to the bar, and condemned to death or long prison terms. One nation was an exception to this rule of law: Austria.

Her population harbored a massive ratio of members of the Nazi Party. Tens of thousands of war criminals found their way back to Austria, quietly melting back into the mass of the population, secure in the knowledge that few neighbors, if any, would betray them to authorities. Their confidence was well placed, for most such neighbors were in fact sympathizers, if not actual participants in the worst of these deeds. The same was true of the police authorities. The man who arrested Anne Frank and sent her to Belsen was recently discovered as an Austrian policeman.

Over the years a few stout hearts who have never forgotten clamored for Austria to bring some of these butchers to trial. I speak of concentration camp commandants, camp guards, and the like. Some were openly living under their own names, even though they were widely known to be guilty of unspeakable crimes.

At last, in the past year, a few token trials were put on by Austrian authorities. And the entire Western World looked on in disbelief and shock at the result.

At Auschwitz, 3 million Jews were exterminated on an orderly assembly-line basis. Some men who designed and built these extermination facilities were brought to trial and found innocent of any criminal activity.

Austria did not blanch at that. She put on a second trial. The defendant was typical of a certain class of Nazi war criminal, of which there are thousands alive and well today in Austria. This beast was a former Nazi SS officer in the Mauthausen Concentration Camp, a mass murder facility. His name is Johann Gogl, and he acknowledged in open court that in 1944 he commanded a section at this camp called the "Stairway of Death."

According to witness testimony, prisoners were forced to drag 110-pound stones up 186 steep steps of a stone quarry. Those who did not perish on the steps were thrown into an electric fence when they reached the top. Gogl's name, according to testimony, was on the death orders.

Gogl, like the rest of his kind, said he did not know what was being done; that his name was forged. His attorneys produced a petition signed by 268 persons, virtually the entire adult population of his home village of Ottnang, declaring he could not be guilty because he dedicated his life to saving life, a reference to his membership in a mountain rescue unit. How touching.

This, then, is what Austria conceals beneath her smiling facade of mountains, skiing, snow and "gemütlichkeit." Come to happy Austria and vacation with all the jolly old butchers of noncombatants. For they are everywhere in that accursed nation, and the entire world knows it. Austria sees fit to infuriate civilization by staging nonsense trials of the seum of the earth, and then acquits them.

We all know the real story. None of these people will ever be punished for their unspeakable deeds. After all, who were those they murdered? Who cares? And it was so long ago, wasn't it?

Where are the great voices of conscience who plead for even-handedness in the Middle East? I hear them not. I see them not.

I say, let Austria claim her own and hug them to her national bosom. She deserves them. And they deserve her. These young demonstrators who perpetrated the action against the Austrian Embassy did not do a nice thing. They did not do a legal thing. But they certainly did an understandable one.

ESCALATION, AMERICAN OPTIONS, AND PRESIDENT NIXON'S WAR MOVES—PART II

HON. RONALD V. DELLUMS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 1972

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, following is the continuation of study materials on American involvement in Indochina which were first put into the Record on May 10, 1972, and which the Government Printing Office did not have room to print fully.

The rest of the materials follow:

sionable and the less-gifted even more so. It is therefore imperative that this particular group have teachers with great expertise, patience, and warm, reassuring personalities. Mrs. Degason exemplifies these qualities to the finest degree.

Her city, State, and the children she has helped all owe her a great debt of gratitude.

FEDERAL HEALTH PROGRAMS

SPEECH OF

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 10, 1972

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the people of the United States surely rank their personal health of utmost importance among their many needs.

This is true in every corner of the country, from our smallest rural communities to our largest industrial cities. It is true of rich Americans as well as poor Americans. It is true among all ages of our people. It is even true of Democrats and Republicans alike.

Together, we need to achieve the goal of better health throughout the lives of all the people of this Nation.

Is there a national health crisis? There is indeed.

What do we need to do about it?

We need to work toward preventive health care for all Americans. We need to train young men and women in the many health professions—and we need to train them now, before the already serious shortages in health personnel become critical. We need to advance the knowledge of medicine through research that is simultaneously broad and specific. We need to make more health services available to more people. We need to reduce the high costs of curing illness. We need to give extra support to those health-care institutions and training facilities that are in financial distress.

On the part of the Federal Government, these needs can be met only through the authorized programs of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Yet with its proposed budget for fiscal year 1973, the Nixon administration would let all too many of these needs go unmet.

President Nixon may have acknowledged a national health crisis in his public speeches, but he has not taken it into full account in his budget recommendations. There is too little evidence in this budget that the President ranks concern for health as highly as the general public does.

In the proposed 1973 budget, health manpower programs are severely curtailed. Grants for building or modernizing hospitals, community clinics, and health schools are all but eliminated. Worthy programs to combat mental illness and alcoholism are not allowed to grow. Important health services, designed to deliver adequate care to all Americans, are held in place or actually reduced, considering increased operating costs and Federal pay raises. Most of the research institutes are given increases that amount to only half the annual inflation rate for health research.

If the goal of better health for all Americans is to be achieved in our day, or in our children's day, then the Congress will have to show more concern for Federal health programs in the coming fiscal year than the Nixon administration has shown. It is a duty that cannot be ignored by the Members of the House. It is our responsibility to the health and well-being of our people.

PLEA FOR NATIONAL REPENTANCE

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 1972

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, this morning, I was privileged to receive a most eloquent "Plea for National Repentance" over the inhuman terror we have wrought in Southeast Asia. This statement is being circulated in petition form and will be presented to Congress at a later date. I include the item in the Record at the conclusion of these remarks.

I am also including "War Is Peace," a paper on the President's latest escalation by Fred Branfman. Mr. Branfman, who is director of Project Air War, is one of the foremost experts on our air tactics and weaponry in Indochina, and I commend his paper to you.

The articles follow:

A PLEA FOR NATIONAL REPENTANCE AND A PETITION TO THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES

Whereas, millions of Vietnamese, Cambodians and Laotians have been maimed and uprooted from their homes and more than one-half million killed;

Whereas, more than 50,000 Americans have been killed in Indo-China and 300,000 have suffered casualties;

Whereas, the lands and cities of Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos have been devastated by napalm, defoliants, bombs and all the vast arsenal of the automated air war;

Whereas, the lives of United States prisoners held by the North Vietnamese are now threatened by the further escalation of the war;

Whereas, the war waged by the United States in Indo-China wastes our human and material resources and weakens our security rather than insuring it;

Whereas, the United States armed forces continue to impose upon the people of Vietnam the Thieu government dictatorship, thus depriving the Vietnamese people the inalienable right of freedom;

Whereas, the peace of the whole world is threatened by the recent escalation of the war by the United States, including the mining of Vietnam harbors, thus risking the beginning of World War III;

We, the undersigned citizens of the United States repent of our own complicity in this sin against the Providence of God and this crime against humanity; and we call for a national time of mourning and repentance.

We petition the Congress of the United States to take its proper responsibility for ending participation by the United States in the war in Indo-China by cutting off funds used for the prosecution of the war, that sanity and justice may be restored in the foreign relations of the United States government.

WAR IS PEACE

(By Fred Branfman)

(NOTE.—Mr. Branfman spent 4 years in Laos, from 1967 through 1971. He is currently director of Project Air War, a research group in Washington, D.C. He is editor of *Voices From The Plain of Jars*, to be published this month by Harper and Row.)

rency director of Project Air War, a research group in Washington, D.C. He is editor of *Voices From The Plain of Jars*, to be published this month by Harper and Row.)

"All entrances to the North Vietnamese ports will be mined . . . United States forces have been directed to take appropriate measures within the internal and claimed territorial waters of North Vietnam to interdict the delivery of any supplies. Rail and all other communications will be cut off to the maximum extent possible. Air and naval strikes against military targets in North Vietnam will continue . . . You want peace. I want peace . . . and that is why, my fellow Americans, tonight I ask you for your support of this decision—a decision which has only one purpose—not to expand the war, not to escalate the war, but to end this war and to win the kind of peace that will last. With God's help, with your support, we will accomplish that great goal."—Richard Nixon, May 8, 1972.

George Orwell predicted that the leaders of major powers would come to wage war by machine and call it peace; that they would annihilate distant and unseen societies from the air even as they constantly reiterated their earnest desires for peace at home.

On May 8, 1972, Richard Nixon announced the most serious and dramatic set of escalations in the Indochina war, removing the last remaining restraints on automated war observed by his predecessor; at the same time, he used the terms "peace" or "ending the war" on 19 separate occasions in a 17-minute talk.

He didn't quite claim that "war is peace." But then he did not have to.

His speech was one of the most striking attempts to rewrite history in recent memory. Virtually every sentence in it contradicted the written record, ranging from the writings of Lacouture and Fall, to the Pentagon and Kissinger papers, to today's newspapers.

Two tons of bombs were exploding every 60 seconds as he solemnly declared "I, too, want to end this war," mines were being laid in and around Soviet vessels as he called upon the Soviet Union not to "slide back into the dark shadows of a previous age."

It is as much in wonderment as dismay that one turns to an analysis of some of the more striking distortions and outright falsehoods of this remarkable speech:

1. INVASION—"FIVE WEEKS AGO, ON EASTER WEEKEND, THE COMMUNIST ARMIES OF NORTH VIETNAM LAUNCHED A MASSIVE INVASION OF SOUTH VIETNAM"

The very basis of the 1954 Geneva Settlement on Vietnam is that Viet Nam is one country. There is no reference to a "South Vietnam." The 17th parallel, far from being an "international border" as the President claimed in his April 26 speech, was merely a temporary military demarcation line. Point 6 of the Joint Declaration by the 9 powers guaranteeing the settlement specifically states that: "the military demarcation line is provisional and should not in any way be interpreted as constituting a political or territorial boundary." This line was only in force for 300 days following July 21, 1954, and was meant merely to mark time until a 1956 election which would unite Viet Nam. When the Diem regime did not allow this election, the 17th parallel lost any legal, political, or moral meaning. The cancellation of the elections threw the issue of who would rule in Viet Nam back to the Vietnamese themselves.

2. ORIGINS—"WE AMERICANS DID NOT CHOOSE TO RESORT TO WAR—IT HAS BEEN FORCED UPON US"

In fact, the United States did indeed unilaterally choose this war two decades ago, when the Truman Administration decided to pay ¾ of the costs of the war for the French between 1950 and 1954. And the Geneva Accords were barely signed when in August 1954, while Mr. Nixon was vice-

E - 242,928

S - 284,097

MAY 11 1972

Report Denies Nixon Followed Private Advice

By ROBERT E. BASKIN
Washington Bureau

WASHINGTON—The White House denied Wednesday reports that the advice of two men influenced President Nixon finally on his decision to mine North Vietnamese ports and otherwise interdict traffic into the Communist country.

"I think it would be a mistake," press secretary Ronald Ziegler said, "to assume that Connally and Kissinger were the only ones with whom the President consulted."

The New York Times and CBS implied that Nixon's decision was reached only after he had talked with Treasury Secretary John B. Connally and his national security adviser, Dr. Henry Kissinger.

A New York Times dispatch spoke of "final, sober private talks with the two men who were closest to him during his deliberations."

The facts of the situation are somewhat different, according to White House sources.

Nixon apparently made his decision within the last week, but he wished to consult as many people as possible before announcing it.

Monday morning he called the National Security Council into session. There was a general discussion of Vietnamese policy, and Nixon outlined his plans.

Later he went to the executive office building, across the street from the White House, where he has a secluded office.

A number of persons were called in for a last minute review of his speech, which was made at 9 p.m., Washington time.

Nixon spent approximately 20 minutes with Connally, talking in a philosophical manner about the decision, which had already been made and was not subject to change at that point. Connally's advice on the long-range economic effects of the action was sought.

Nixon had asked Connally to attend the meeting of the National Security Council, of which Connally is not a member, because he was aware of the domestic and political connotations of the action that he contemplated. The former Texas governor, whose role in foreign financial affairs is significant, was considered an appropriate official to be included in the NSC's discussion.

There were others who conferred with Nixon Monday afternoon, but none of them influenced a decision that had already been made and could only be made by the President.

The President consulted with Kissinger, of course, at some length because he had been to Moscow and Paris recently. But he also conferred with Secretary of State William P. Rogers, who had been summoned home from Europe, Defense Secretary Melvin Laird, CIA director Richard Helms and members of the joint chiefs of staff.

Nixon had deliberated over his action for about a week. His final decision was made during last weekend while he was at Camp David.

There is no evidence that Connally had a pre-eminent place in the final deliberations. A decision of the kind Nixon announced Monday night involves too many elements of the government, all of which must be taken into account.

Connally, it must be recognized, has been in favor of strong military action in Vietnam ever since the United States involvement started there. He supported President Johnson in all of his actions in Vietnam. Undoubtedly, if called upon for advice, he would have advised Nixon to take just the action he did

on the mining of the North Vietnamese harbor.

But administration sources make it clear that Connally was not the man who made the decision. It was the President of the United States.